

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 6 and 14 to no longer recite language that may have been construed as means plus function language. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) on Spiegel (U.S. Patent No. 5,649,108). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, “allocating, in the network nodes, an allocation rule based on the determined routes, wherein, based on the allocation rule, a forwarding information item is allocated to a link leading to the destination network node and to a new forwarding information item for each destination network node.” Spiegel does not disclose or suggest such features.

Initially, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to address the arguments contained in applicant’s response filed February 21, 2006. Specifically, in the action dated March 24, 2006, the Examiner did not respond to applicant’s arguments that Spiegel does not disclose or suggest “allocating ... a forwarding information item ... to a link leading to the destination network node and to a new forwarding information item.”

As previously argued, Spiegel discloses a forwarding table containing forwarding information, however, Spiegel’s forwarding table is not used to forward a setup packet; it is only used to forward a subsequent, non-setup, cell as disclosed at col. 6, lines 23-27. The setup packet of Siegel is instead forwarded by means of the routing table, which does not allocate a forwarding information item to a link to the destination node and to a new forwarding information item (col. 5, lines 55-62; col. 6, lines 19-27).

Furthermore, claim 1, as amended, recites, “using the allocation rule, forwarding the setup message via a link allocated to the forwarding information item in the network node, after replacement of the forwarding information item in the setup message by the new forwarding information item allocated to the former forwarding information item.” Spiegel does not disclose or suggest such features. In particular, Spiegel does not disclose replacing a forwarding information

item “in the setup message.” Spiegel does not disclose that a forwarding information item is present in the setup message, let alone that the information item is replaced by a new forwarding information item allocated to the former forwarding information item. Accordingly, Spiegel does not disclose that a replacement of a forwarding information item occurs within the setup message as recited in claim 1.

Spiegel does disclose that a forwarding table, which contains forwarding information, of a line interface is updated (col. 6, line 23-26), however, this does not disclose or suggest that forwarding information is updated within a setup message as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, although Spiegel may disclose that packets are updated (col. 6, lines 1-12), Spiegel does not suggest that this update refers to forwarding information contained in a setup packet, nor does Spiegel make any suggestion as to how the update of the packets and the update of the forwarding table are related.

Spiegel discloses a networking system which is much slower than that claimed by applicant. Spiegel discloses forwarding only subsequent cells by means of a forwarding information table based on a search of a routing table (col. 5, lines 58-62; col. 6, lines 11-15, 25-28, 43-52) and not by replacing forwarding information within the setup packet.


Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable due at least to their respective dependencies. Claim 14 recites features substantially similar to those of claim 1 discussed above, and is therefore also allowable for at least the above reasons.

Applicant solicits an early action allowing the claims.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief, including extensions of time, and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **449122002600**.

Dated: July 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Adam Keser

Registration No. 54,217
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7301